

Remarks

Claims 1, 4, 5-10, 12 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor. Applicants respectfully traverse rejection. The examiner states that the reference discloses a device in which both the hub and body engage a bore. The device disclosed in Taylor, however, is a bomb that is dropped from an aircraft. A bomb does not engage with a bore and therefore the device disclosed in Taylor cannot meet the limitations of the claims at issue.

Claims 1, 4-10, 14, 15 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alford et al. Applicant notes the projectile disclosed in Alford et al. is designed to be fired from a bore. Applicant notes, however, there is no specific teaching of a bore engaging portion or a portion that engages with the bore. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 have been amended to specifically state that the rear portion engages with a bore. Alford et al. clearly does not disclose or suggest that the bore engaging portion be the second portion as set forth in claims 1, 8, 14 and 15. Accordingly, Alford et al. cannot anticipate the claims at issue.

Applicant notes claims 2 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, but Taylor clearly also does not disclose or suggest the bore engaging portion of claims 1 and 8 upon which claims 2 and 12 depend. Accordingly, the reference cannot form the basis for finding the claims prima facie obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance notice of which is respectfully urged. The examiner, however, may contact the undersigned by telephone should any minor issue remain outstanding after entry of this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

21 FEBRUARY 2008
DATE

Marc A. Rossi
MARC A. ROSSI
REG. No. 31,923
P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)